

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 26, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-3 and 5-15 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-15 are amended and claims 16-30 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action asserts that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on March 24, 2004 fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance. Applicants respectfully submit that page 2 of the IDS, item 4, clearly indicates that the relevance of the non-English language reference, which is JP 9-204361, is discussed in the Specification. Applicants also respectfully point to the Specification at, for example, page 2, line 7, which discusses the non-English language reference. However, it appears that some confusion may arise from the fact that the IDS filed March 24, 2004 indicates that the document number is "9-204361" while the Specification discusses Japanese Patent Application Laid-Open No. "H9-204361". Thus, for the Examiner's convenience, an IDS is hereby filed that submits the Japanese patent application with more clarity. Thus, consideration of the Japanese application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Imamura et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116551); claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,126); claims 1-3, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,064) in view of Imamura;

claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Imamura and further in view of Angelo (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,882); claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Imamura and further in view of Usami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,149); claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba and Imamura and further in view of Matsuo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,513); claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba and Imamura in view of Yasu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,912,849); claims 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo; claims 16-17, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo and Imamura; claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo and Angelo; claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo, Angelo and Imamura; claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo and Usami; claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo and Yasu; claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Imamura and Yoshimaru (U.S. Patent No. 4,641,294); claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba and Imamura in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,654,781); claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba in view of Matsuo, Imamura and Yoshimaru; and claims 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chiba and Matsuo in view of Imamura and Schwartz. The cancellation of claims 4 and 16-30 renders their rejections moot. With respect to claims 1-3 and 5-15, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, the present application claims a memory device that includes a first data area that stores first data that are not encrypted, a second data area that stores second data that are not encrypted, a third data area that stores third data, a fourth data area that stores fourth data that are obtained by encrypting the second data, and a

controller that allows reading or writing of the first data when the third data matches with the second data, wherein the third data is obtained by decrypting the fourth data, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 15.

Chiba teaches a data processing apparatus that includes a processing unit, a main storage unit, a main storage control unit, a key storage unit and a key storage control unit (Abstract). The Office Action alleges that Chiba teaches features of independent claims 1 and 15 and asserts that Chiba teaches the formerly claimed nonvolatile first key data area and the nonvolatile second key data area (Office Action, page 6, lines 1-13; page 15, lines 1-11). A close examination of Chiba reveals that Chiba teaches a main storage unit and a key storage unit for storing a main storage protection key (column 2, lines 6-8). The Office Action relies on this portion of Chiba to disclose the claimed nonvolatile first key data area, which is data that is not encrypted. However, Chiba fails to disclose or suggest that the encrypted data is also stored. Thus, Chiba fails to teach both the unencrypted password and the encrypted password that are sent to the recipient are stored in the memory device. Chiba merely teaches “a key storage unit” and a “main storage unit” that stores a “main storage protection key” (Col. 2, lines 6-8), but does not teach that any of the storage units store both encrypted data or password and unencrypted data or password. Thus, Chiba fails to disclose or suggest a fourth data area that stores fourth data that are obtained by encrypting the second data, wherein third data is obtained by decrypting the fourth data, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 15.

Furthermore, the Office Action admits that Chiba fails to disclose or suggest the claimed controller that allows reading or writing data when the first key data matches

with the second key data (Office Action, page 6, lines 14-15), and relies on Imamura to disclose or suggest this feature. However, Imamura fails to cure deficiencies in Chiba in disclosing or rendering obvious this feature because Imamura does not teach a third data area that stores third data, a fourth data area that stores fourth data that are obtained by encrypting the second data, wherein the third data is obtained by decrypting the fourth data, as recited in the independent claims.

Angelo teaches a method for permitting access to secured computer resources based upon a two-piece user verification process (Abstract). The subject matter of amended claims 1 and 15 is similar to the subject matter of former claim 4, and that claim was rejected over a combination of Chiba, Imamura and Angelo. However, Angelo fails to cure deficiencies in both Chiba and Imamura in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of independent claims 1 and 15 because Angelo fails to teach the above-discussed feature of claims 1 and 15, and because Angelo teaches a “two-piece authentication procedure” that requires both password and a token storing the encryption key and algorithm to generate the system password and is compared to the stored value in the PC (Abstract). Thus, Angelo teaches a “two-piece” encryption and decryption system and does not teach that a memory device stores both encrypted data or password and unencrypted data or password.

Usami teaches a data processing device having a main memory comprised of a nonvolatile memory and a CPU, and memory protection and security being ensured for its programs (Abstract).

Matsuo teaches a semiconductor storage device with a semiconductor memory for storing various data, a connector portion, and a memory control portion for controlling reading of data and writing of data (Abstract).

Yasu teaches a semiconductor memory device divided into plural blocks that include a memory array, plural storage elements and a setting circuit to set the information to the plural storage elements (Abstract).

Yoshimaru teaches an optical disk apparatus with an optical head for recording information on or reproducing information from an optical disk (Abstract).

Schwartz teaches a random access memory having the capability to access one or more bytes in one or more memory word locations of a multi-byte memory array within one memory cycle (Abstract).

However, none of these additional references, alone or in combination, cure deficiencies in Chiba and Imamura in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of independent claims 1 and 15. Thus, independent claims 1 and 15 are patentable over all the applied references.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-14, at least for their dependence on patentable claim 1, and for their additional limitations, are also patentable over all the applied references.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 108391-00038.**

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration Number 55,478

Attachments: Information Disclosure Statement
JP-H9-204361

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN/cvd